

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Charles Hymes et al.

Application No.: 10/633,250

Confirmation No.: 4797

Filed: July 31, 2003

Art Unit: 2179

For: AUTOMATIC MANAGEMENT OF THE
VISUAL SPACE WHILE PERFORMING A
TASK

Appellee: N. Augustine

APPEAL BRIEF

MS Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

As required under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(a), this brief is filed within two months of the Notice of Appeal filed in this case on September 24, 2008, and is in furtherance of said Notice of Appeal.

No fees are required for this Appeal Brief, as they were paid for with the Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief filed September 26, 2007.

This brief contains items under the following headings as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 and M.P.E.P. § 1206:

- | | |
|-------|---|
| I. | Real Party In Interest |
| II | Related Appeals and Interferences |
| III. | Status of Claims |
| IV. | Status of Amendments |
| V. | Summary of Claimed Subject Matter |
| VI. | Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal |
| VII. | Argument |
| VIII. | Claims Appendix |
| IX. | Evidence Appendix |
| X. | Related Proceedings Appendix |

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal is:

InterVoice Limited Partnership.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this Appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

A. Total Number of Claims in Application

There are 29 claims pending in application.

B. Current Status of Claims

1. Claims canceled: 0
2. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: 0
3. Claims pending: 1-29
4. Claims allowed: 0
5. Claims rejected: 1-29

C. Claims On Appeal

The claims on appeal are claims 1-29

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Appellant filed an Amendment After Final Rejection on August 11, 2008. The Appellee responded to the Amendment After Final Rejection in an Advisory Action mailed August 15, 2008. The Amendment After Final Rejection did not propose amendments to the claims. In the Advisory Action, the Appellee rejected Appellants' arguments. The claims in the Claims Appendix of Appendix A incorporate the amendments indicated in the paper filed by Appellant on June 25, 2008.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

A concise summary of subject matter of the independent claims involved in the appeal, which refers to the specification and to the drawings by reference characters, is provided below. All references to the specification and drawings are made by way of example for the convenience of the Board. No limitation on the following claim language is intended.

An embodiment of the invention, as set forth in claim 1, provides a graphical user interface displayed on an agent desktop in a contact center. The graphical user interface includes a task bar (Fig. 2 item 212; ¶ [0022], pg. 3 lns. 26-30). The task bar includes one or more icons for identifying managed applications (Fig. 2 item 210; ¶ [0022], pg. 3 lns. 26-30). The graphical user interface also includes a managed application display area (Fig. 2 item 206; ¶ [0022], pg. 3 lns. 37-49). The managed application display area displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected (Fig. 3 item 301; ¶ [0033], pg. 5 lns. 4-17) wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow that guides an agent's handling of a contact (Fig. 3 item 301; ¶ [0033], pg. 5 lns. 4-17). A predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the icon is selected according to the step of the automated workflow (Fig. 2 items 206, 208; ¶¶ [0031]-[0032], pg. 4 lns. 27-61).

An embodiment of the invention, as set forth in claim 8, provides a method of managing a visual space of a customer relations management application. The method includes displaying a managed display having a managed application display area (Fig. 2 item 206; ¶ [0022], pg. 3 lns. 37-49) and a task bar (Fig. 2 item 212; ¶ [0022], pg. 3 lns. 26-30). The task bar includes one or more icons for identifying managed applications (Fig. 2 item 210; ¶ [0022], pg. 3 lns. 26-30). The method also includes executing an automated workflow that defines a plurality of steps for managing a customer call (Fig. 3 item 301; ¶ [0033], pg. 5 lns. 4-50). The automated workflow has at least one step corresponding to each one of the one or more icons (¶ [0029], pg. 4 lns. 61-65), and at least one of the icons is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow (Fig. 3 item 301; ¶ [0033], pg. 5 lns. 4-17). A managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in the managed application display area (¶ [0033], pg. 5 lns. 4-17), and a predetermined set of

rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the managed application in the managed application display area when the icon identifying the managed application is selected (Fig. 2 items 206, 208; ¶¶ [0031]-[0032], pg. 4 lns. 27-61).

An embodiment of the invention, as set forth in claim 14, provides a graphical user interface for displaying on an agent's desktop in a contact center (Fig. 2 item 200; ¶ [0020], pg. 2 lns. 40-44) in a system having a central processor, a display, a memory and an input devices (Fig. 1 item 150; ¶ [0015], pg. 2 lns. 38-40). The graphical user interface includes a managed display having a task bar (Fig. 2 item 212; ¶ [0022], pg. 3 lns. 26-30) that has one or more icons for identifying managed applications (Fig. 2 item 210; ¶ [0022], pg. 3 lns. 26-30). The managed applications are applications managed, at least in part, by an automated workflow (¶ [0022], pg. 3 lns. 26-42). The graphical user interface also includes an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling the agent's handling of a contact (Fig. 3 items 300, 3001; ¶ [0033], pg. 4 lns. 64-66 – pg. 5 lns. 1-4). The automated workflow has at least one step corresponding to each one of the one or more icons (¶ [0022], pg. 3 lns. 56-63), and one of the one or more icons is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow (¶ [0034], pg. 5 lns. 20-35). A managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in a managed application display area (¶ [0033]; pg. 5 lns. 4-17), where a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the managed application in the managed application display area when the icon identifying the managed application is selected according to the at least one step of the automated workflow (Fig. 2 items 206, 208; ¶¶ [0031]-[0032], pg. 4 lns. 27-61).

An embodiment of the invention, as set forth in claim 21, provides a graphical user interface displayed on an agent desktop in a contact center (Fig. 2 item 200; ¶ [0020]; pg. 2 lns. 40-44). The graphical user interface includes a quick start bar (Fig. 2 item 214; ¶ [0027]; pg. 4 lns. 32-38) that includes one or more icons for identifying non-managed applications (Fig. 2 item 216; ¶ [0027]; pg. 4 lns. 17-38). The graphical user interface also includes a contact center control panel presenting current contact information (Fig. 2 item 212; ¶ [0026]; pg. 4 lns. 1-15), where the information presented indicates a type of call placed by the current contact to the contact center (Fig. 2 item 202; ¶ [0026]; pg. 4 lns. 1-15). The graphical user interface also includes a managed display with a task bar that includes one or more icons for identifying managed applications (Fig 2 item 212; ¶ [0022]; pg. 3 lns. 26-63). The graphical

user interface also includes a managed application display area wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of a managed application in the managed application display area (Fig. 2 items 206, 208; ¶¶ [0031]-[0032], pg. 4 lns. 27-61). The graphical user interface further includes an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling an agent's handling of the current contact (Fig. 3 items 300, 3001; ¶[0033], pg. 4 lns. 64-66 – pg. 5 lns. 1-4) and having at least one step corresponding to each one of the one or more icons (¶ [0034], pg. 5 lns. 20-35). One of the one or more icons is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow and the type of call indicated by the contact center control panel (¶ [0034], pg. 5 lns. 20-35), and the managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in the managed application display area (¶ [0033]; pg. 5 lns. 4-17) wherein the managed application identified by the selected icon is selectively displayed in a separate window (¶ [0022], pg. 49-52)

An embodiment of the invention, as set forth in claim 26, provides a method for managing a graphical user interface of an agent's desktop in a contact center. The method includes receiving a call at the call center (¶ [0021], pg. 3 lns. 6-9; ¶ [0033], pg. 5 lns. 4-6), the call having one of a plurality of media types (¶ [0026], pg. 4 lns. 5-7; ¶ [0034], pg. 5 lns. 20-25). The method also includes automatically opening one or more applications on the agent's desktop suitable for aiding the agent in handling the call depending, at least in part, upon the one media type (¶ [0033], pg. 5 lns. 13-18). The method further includes automatically re-configuring the appearance of the graphical user interface as the agent follows steps of a pre-programmed call handling work flow (¶ [0035], pg. 5 lns. 37-50).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramaniam (U.S. App. No. 2007/0118504) (hereinafter "*Subramaniam*") in view of Bartz et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,080,327) (hereinafter "*Bartz*").

VII. ARGUMENT

Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Subramaniam* in view of *Bartz*. The test for non-obvious subject matter is whether the differences between the subject matter and the prior art are such that the claimed subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to

which the subject matter pertains. The United States Supreme Court in *Graham v. John Deere & Co.* set forth the factual inquiries which must be considered in applying the statutory test: (1) determining of the scope and content of the prior art; (2) ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue; and (3) resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. 383 U.S. 1 (1966)

Appellant respectfully asserts that the claims include non-obvious differences over the cited art. As discussed further below, the rejections should be withdrawn because, when considering the scope and content of the applied *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* references, there are significant differences between the applied combination and claims 1-26, as the applied combination fails to disclose all elements of these claims. Considering the lack of disclosure in the applied combination of all elements of claims 1-26, one of ordinary skill in the art would not find these claims obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103. The rejections of claims 1-29 should, therefore, be withdrawn at least for this reason.

A. Claims 1-7

1. Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, in part, “a managed application display area that displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow.” Appellee argues that both *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* disclose the this portion of claim 1. Final Action, pp. 3-4. But neither reference discloses selecting an icon according to a step in an automated workflow.

Appellee incorrectly asserts that *Subramaniam*, at figure 26 and paragraph [0082], discloses a graphical user interface wherein icons are “selected according to a step in an automated workflow.” Final Action, pg. 2. Figure 26 merely discloses interfaces for accessing the searching capability of the application disclosed by *Subramaniam*. Neither Figure 26, nor the portions of *Subramaniam* explaining Figure 26 disclose that an icon is selected according to a step of an automated workflow. *See Subramaniam*, paras. [0162]-[0164]. Paragraph [0082] also fails to disclose the claimed “wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow.” Though paragraph [0082] discloses that server programs in the *Subramaniam* system may execute workflow and enforce business

rules, paragraph [0082] does not disclose that the server programs select an icon in a graphical user interface according to a step of an automated workflow.

Bartz also fails to disclose the claimed “managed application display area that displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow.” *Bartz* discloses a GUI that comprises a plurality of “graphic elements,” which “are icons rendered as buttons.” *Bartz* 7:65-67, 8:1-2. According to *Bartz* the graphic elements (icons) are either “activated” or “deactivated.” The terms activate and deactivate are not synonymous with selecting. Rather, the terms refer to a user’s ability to select a graphic element. *See Bartz* 8:13-14 (“An active element, when selected by a user, will initiate an action. An inactive element will not initiate an action if selected by a user.”). In *Bartz*, a task is not initiated in response to an icon being activated or deactivated. Rather, *Bartz* discloses a system in which tasks are initiated in response to a user *selecting* a particular icon. *Bartz* expressly states that “[e]lements are selected by a user,” and “user selection of an active element initiates a particular task.” *Bartz* 8:26, 8:35-36. *Bartz* does not, therefore, teach or suggest the claimed “wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow.”

Appellee specifically argues that *Bartz*, at column 2, lines 49-62, discloses the claimed “wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow.” Advisory Action, pg. 2. The cited portions of column 2 merely disclose that graphic elements are displayed in an order that corresponds to the order in which the tasks *should* be logically performed. As discussed above, the graphic elements disclosed by *Bartz* are icons that correspond to a particular task. *Bartz* does not disclose that task icons therein are *automatically* performed according to a step in an automatic workflow. *Bartz*, like *Subramaniam*, fails to disclose the claimed “a managed application display area that displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow.”

The combination of *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* does not teach or suggest the portion of claim 1 that recites “a managed application display area that displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected wherein the icon is

selected according to a step in an automated workflow,” and Appellee has failed to clearly articulate why the aforementioned portion of claim 1 would have been obvious. The rejection of record, therefore, does not make a *prima facie* case of obviousness and should be withdrawn. *See In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048 (CCPA 1976).

Claim 1 further recites “wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area.” Appellee argues that this portion of claim 1 is disclosed by *Subramaniam*, paragraphs [0072]-[0073] and [0082], and *Bartz*, 2:43-46, 59-66, 4:44-47, 7:57-67, 8:1-48, and figure 4A. Final Action, pp. 3-4. Neither *Subramaniam* nor *Bartz*, however, discloses this portion of claim 1.

Paragraphs [0072] and [0073] describe the multi-layered architecture of the system disclosed by *Subramaniam*. According to these paragraphs, a user Interface layer 110 provides tools, such as applets, views, charts, and reports, associated with one or more applications, and an object manager layer, which is designed to manage business rules associated with one or more applications, provides an interface between the user interface layer and a data manager layer. Paragraphs [0072] and [0073] do not disclose the aforementioned portion of claim 1 because nothing in these paragraphs discloses predetermined rules that determine size, placement and visibility of a managed application in a graphical user interface.

Paragraph [0082] also fails to disclose “wherein a predetermined set of rules determines size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application.” Paragraph [0082] merely discloses that server programs in the system disclosed by *Subramaniam* can be designed to perform functions including “importing and exporting data, configuring the database, executing workflow and process automation, [etc].” Although paragraph [0082] discloses that server programs in the *Subramaniam* system may execute workflow and enforce business rules, paragraph [0082] does not disclose that the server enforces a predetermined set of rules that determines the size, placement, and visibility of a managed application.

The cited portions of *Bartz* also fail to disclose the claimed “wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area.” Although *Bartz* discloses a system in which a user selected element is associated with windows, nothing in the cited portions of *Bartz* suggests that a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application. Because the proposed combination of *Bartz* and *Subramaniam* fails to disclose the claimed “wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area,” the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

The combination of *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* does not teach or suggest the portion of claim 1 that recites “a managed application display area that displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow,” and Appellee has failed to clearly articulate why this portion of claim 1 would have been obvious. The rejection of record, therefore, does not make a *prima facie* case of obviousness and should be withdrawn. *See In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048 (CCPA 1976).

As discussed in this section, the rejection of record fails to set forth the differences in claim 1 over the applied references. The rejection of record also fails to set forth the proposed modification of the applied references necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter or an explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to make the proposed modification as required by *Graham v. John Deere and Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) and M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 should be reversed.

2. Dependent Claims 2-7

Dependent claims 2-7 inherit all the limitations of independent claim 1. As shown above, the combination of *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* fails to teach each limitation of claim 1. Claims 2-7 are patentable at least for their dependence from claim 1. Moreover, dependent claims 2-7 present additional subject matter that is not taught by *Subramaniam* or *Bartz*. Accordingly, Appellant requests that the rejections of claims 2-7 be reversed.

a. Dependent Claim 3

Claim 3 recites “a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes one or more icons for identifying non-managed applications.” Appellee admits that *Subramaniam* does not disclose the claimed “quick start bar” but argues that *Bartz*, at figure 4A, discloses a quick start bar that includes one or more icons for identifying non-managed applications. Final Action, pg. 5. Appellee’s argument is unsupported by the facts of record.

Bartz cannot disclose the claimed “quick start bar” because it does not disclose any task or tool bar that includes icons for identifying “non-managed applications.” Appellee apparently likens the claimed “quick start bar” to toolbars 410 and 420 illustrated by figure 4A. Neither of these toolbars (410 or 420) satisfies the claimed “quick start bar” because neither includes icons that “identify non-managed applications.”

To aid the Board in understanding the claimed “non-managed applications,” the Board’s attention is drawn to paragraph [0027] of the present application.

[0027] The Desktop 204 presents the non-managed applications that may be accessed by an Agent 150 while using the Graphical User Interface 200 . . . The non-managed applications included in the Desktop 204 are not found in the Agent or Contact Workflow 300, 301 (FIG. 3). Rather, the non-managed applications include those applications that an Agent 150 may choose to use outside and separate from handling contacts. These applications will often include applications that are packaged with the operating system as well as corporate e-mail applications and calendaring applications such as Outlook®. In the current embodiment, a quick start bar 214 is provided that includes Application Icons 216 for both managed and unmanaged applications.

Present Application, para. [0027]. In view of paragraph [0027], a person skilled in the art would understand that the claimed “non-managed applications” and the tasks associated with elements in *Bartz* are clearly not the same. See MPEP § 2111 (2007) (“The Patent and Trademark Office (“PTO”) determines the scope of claims in patent applications not solely on the basis of the claim language, but upon giving claims their broadest reasonable construction ‘in light of the specification as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art.’”).

Toolbars 410 and 420, which Appellee likens to the claimed “quick start bar,” include graphic elements associated with a particular task, window or workspace. *Bartz*, 8:6-

7. These tasks are not associated with a non-managed applications, but instead are associated with specific tasks or routines within the microcontroller programming application disclosed by *Bartz* and, thus, do not satisfy the claimed “non-managed applications.” The rejection of record should be reversed at least because the proposed combination of *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* does not teach or suggest the claimed “quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes one or more icons for identifying non-managed applications.” The rejection of record also fails to set forth the proposed modification of the applied references necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter or an explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to make the proposed modification as required by *Graham v. John Deere and Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) and M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j).

b. Dependent Claim 4

Claim 4 recites “a contact center control panel presenting current contact information.” Appellee asserts that this portion of claim 4 is disclosed by *Subramaniam*. Final Action, pg. 5 (citing *Subramaniam*, para. [0009] & fig. 19). Appellant has reviewed *Subramaniam* and it does not appear that any portion of *Subramaniam*, much less the cited portions, disclose the aforementioned “contact center control panel.”

Paragraph [0009], which Appellee argues discloses the claimed “contact center control panel presenting current contact information,” merely discloses that eBusiness applications are generally designed to allow organizations to create a single source of customer information and are typically built on a component-based architecture. *Subramaniam*, para. [0009]. This portion of *Subramaniam* is completely removed from any specific application or user interface and in no way suggests a graphical user interface that includes the claimed “contact center control panel.”

Figure 19, cited in the rejection, also fails to disclose the claimed “contact center control panel.” Figure 19 “illustrates properties of an exemplary Search Category object associated with a Search Definition object.” *Subramaniam*, para. [0040]. According to *Subramaniam*, Search Category objects represent “a Search Category against which a search can be performed” and generally “map[] to a Search Index object.” *Subramaniam*, para. [0110]. The “Name” property 1905 illustrated by figure 19 does not refer to a customer or

contact; it “identifies the Search Category.” *Subramaniam*, para. [0116]. And the “Display Name” property 1910 “represents the actual display name of the Search Category.” *Id.* The remaining properties (1915, 1920, and 1925) specify other characteristics of the Search Category. *Id.* The exemplary Search Category object represents the properties of a search that may be performed in the system disclosed by *Subramanian*. It is not a contact center control panel that presents contact information in a graphical user interface.

Appellant has reviewed those portions of *Subramaniam* that were not cited, and no portion of *Subramaniam* discloses the claimed “contact center control panel presenting current contact information.” *Subramaniam* discloses a user interface for performing searches to retrieve information in the disclosed multi-layered system architecture. *See, e.g., Subramaniam*, paras. [0162]-[0164]. This interface does not include “a contact center control panel presenting current contact information.” The rejection of claim 4 should be reversed because the proposed combination of *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* does not teach or suggest the claimed “contact center control panel presenting current contact information.” The rejection of record also fails to set forth the proposed modification of the applied references necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter or an explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to make the proposed modification as required by *Graham v. John Deere and Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) and M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j).

c. Dependent Claim 6

Claim 6 recites “wherein more than one managed application is displayed concurrently in the managed application display area.” Appellee admits that *Subramaniam* does not disclose the aforementioned features of claim 6 but argues that *Bartz* discloses this portion of claim 6. *See* Final Action, pg. 6 (citing *Bartz* 8:35-48). *Bartz* does not disclose the aforementioned portion of claim 6 because *Bartz* does not disclose a system in which *more than one* managed application is displayed concurrently in a managed application display area.

Appellee apparently likens the “tasks” disclosed by *Bartz* to managed applications. Although *Bartz* indicates that more than one window associated with a particular task can be opened in the disclosed graphical user interfaces, these tasks are not “managed applications.”

To aid the Board in understanding the differences between the claimed “managed applications” and *Bartz*’s “tasks,” the Board’s attention is drawn to paragraph [0022] of the present application.

[0022] In this implementation, applications such as the customer’s CRM are put on list of managed applications or “CRM Applications”, each CRM Application’s visual experience is controlled by the Task bar 212, and its corresponding Shutter Icon 210. The Task bar 212 sends messages to the windowing system to reveal, hide and reposition Shutters Managed Applications 208

Present Application, para. [0022]. In view of paragraph [0022], a person skilled in the art would understand that the “managed application” and the tasks associated with elements in *Bartz* are not the same.

The tasks disclosed by *Bartz* are merely routines, or subcomponents, of the microcontroller design tool disclosed by *Bartz*. They are not separate managed applications that are displayed concurrently in a managed application display area of a graphical user interface. Appellee has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claim 6 because *Bartz* does not disclose the portion of claim 6 that recites “wherein more than one managed application is displayed concurrently in the managed application display area.” The rejection of record also fails to set forth the proposed modification of the applied references necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter or an explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to make the proposed modification as required by *Graham v. John Deere and Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) and M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). Accordingly, the rejection of claim 6 should be reversed.

B. Claims 8-13

1. Independent Claim 8

Claim 8 recites, in part, “executing an automated workflow that defines a plurality of steps for managing a customer call.” Appellee argues that this portion of claim 8 is disclosed by *Subramaniam*, at paragraphs [0082] and figure 26. Final Action, pg. 7. *Subramaniam* provides no support for Appellee’s characterization of the reference. Figure 26 merely discloses interfaces for accessing the searching capability of the application disclosed by *Subramaniam*. Neither Figure 26, nor the portions of *Subramaniam* explaining Figure 26

discloses “executing an automated workflow that defines a plurality of steps for managing a customer call”; nor does paragraph [0082], which discloses that server programs in the system disclosed by *Subramaniam* can be designed to perform functions including “importing and exporting data, configuring the database, executing workflow and process automation, [etc.].” Though paragraph [0082] discloses server programs that may execute workflow and enforce business rules, paragraph [0082] does not disclose that the server programs “execute an automated workflow that defines a plurality of steps for managing a customer call.”

In sum, although *Subramaniam* discloses search functionality that purportedly can be used with customer relationship software, *Subramaniam* is unconcerned with the actual handling of a customer call. Rather, *Subramaniam* discloses systems and methods for searching within a multi-layered architecture that includes multiple data sources. And although the multi-layered architecture disclosed by *Subramaniam* employs server programs that can be configured to execute workflow and process automation, nothing in *Subramaniam* discloses “executing an automated workflow that defines a plurality of steps for managing a customer call.”

Claim 8 also recites “the automated workflow having at least one step corresponding to each one of the at least one icon, wherein at least one of the icons is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow.” Appellee argues that this portion of claim 8 is disclosed by *Subramaniam*, at paragraph [0082] and figure 26. Final Action, pg. 7. As discussed above, figure 26 discloses interfaces for accessing the searching capability of the application disclosed by *Subramaniam*. And paragraph [0082] discloses that server programs in the system disclosed by *Subramaniam* can be designed to perform functions including “importing and exporting data, configuring the database, executing workflow and process automation, [etc.].” Neither figure 26 nor paragraph [0082] disclose that the server programs select an icon in a graphical user interface according to a step of an automated workflow. Accordingly, figure 26 and paragraph [0082] fail to disclose the portion of claim 1 that recites “wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow.”

Bartz also fails to disclose the claimed “automated workflow having at least one step corresponding to each one of the at least one icon, wherein at least one of the icons is selected

according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow.” As discussed above, *Bartz* expressly states that “[e]lements are selected by a user,” and “user selection of an active element initiates a particular task.” *Bartz* 8:26, 8:35-36. That is, *Bartz* discloses a system in which tasks are initiated in response to a *user* selecting a particular icon. *Bartz* does not, therefore, teach or suggest the claimed “wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow.”

The rejection of claim 8 should be reversed at least because the proposed combination of *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* does not teach or suggest the portions of claim 8 that recite “executing an automated workflow that defines a plurality of steps for managing a customer call” and “the automated workflow having at least one step corresponding to each one of the at least one icon, wherein at least one of the icons is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow.”

Claim 8 further recites “wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the managed application in the managed application display area.” Appellee argues that this portion of claim 8 is disclosed by *Subramaniam*, paragraphs [0072]-[0073] and [0082], and *Bartz*, 2:43-46, 59-66, 4:44-47, 7:57-67, 8:1-48, and figure 4A. Final Action, pp. 7-8. Neither *Subramaniam* nor *Bartz*, however, discloses this portion of claim 8.

As discussed above, paragraphs [0072] and [0073] merely describe the multi-layered architecture of the system disclosed by *Subramaniam*, and paragraph [0082] discloses that server programs in the system disclosed by *Subramaniam* can be designed to perform functions including “importing and exporting data, configuring the database, executing workflow and process automation, [etc].” Nothing in these paragraphs discloses a predetermined set of rules that determines the size, placement and visibility of a managed application in a managed application display area. The cited portions of *Bartz* also fail to disclose the claimed “wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area.” Although *Bartz* discloses a system in which a user selected element is associated with windows, nothing in the cited portions of *Bartz* suggests that a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application.

The combination of *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* does not teach or suggest the portion of claim 8 that recites “wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the managed application in the managed application display area,” and Appellee has failed to clearly articulate why this portion of claim 8 would have been obvious. The rejection of record, therefore, does not make a *prima facie* case of obviousness and should be withdrawn. *See In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048 (CCPA 1976).

As discussed in this section, the rejection of record fails to set forth the differences in claim 8 over the applied references. The rejection of record also fails to set forth the proposed modification of the applied references necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter or an explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to make the proposed modification as required by *Graham v. John Deere and Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) and M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 8 should be reversed.

2. Dependent Claims 9-13

Dependent claims 9-13 inherit all the limitations of independent claim 8. As shown above, the combination of *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* fails to teach each limitation of claim 8. Claims 9-13 are patentable at least for their dependence from claim 8. Moreover, dependent claims 9-13 present additional subject matter that is not taught by *Subramaniam* or *Bartz*. Accordingly, Appellant requests that the rejections of claims 9-13 be reversed.

a. Dependent Claim 10

Claim 10 recites “displaying a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes on or more icons for identifying non-managed applications.” Appellee admits that *Subramaniam* does not disclose the claimed “displaying a quick start bar” but argues that *Bartz*, at figure 4A, discloses displaying a quick start bar that includes one or more icons for identifying non-managed applications. Final Action, pg. 9. As discussed above, *Bartz* does not disclose the claimed “quick start bar” because it does not disclose any task or tool bar that includes icons for identifying “non-managed applications.” Toolbars 410 and 420, which Appellee likens to the claimed “quick start bar,” include graphic elements associated with a particular task, window or workspace. *Bartz*, 8:6-7. These tasks are not associated with a non-managed applications, but instead are associated with specific tasks within the

microcontroller programming application disclosed by *Bartz* and clearly do not satisfy the claimed “non-managed applications.”

As discussed in this section, the rejection of record fails to set forth the differences in claim 10 over the applied references. The rejection of record also fails to set forth the proposed modification of the applied references necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter or an explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to make the proposed modification as required by *Graham v. John Deere and Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) and M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 10 should be reversed.

b. Dependent Claim 11

Claim 11 recites “displaying a contact center control panel presenting current contact information.” Appellee asserts that this portion of claim 11 is disclosed by *Subramaniam*. Final Action, pg. 9 (citing *Subramaniam*, figs. 19 & 26). As an initial matter, the rejection of claim 11 completely ignores the requirements of 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2) - that Appellee designate as nearly as practicable the particular part of the reference relied on and clearly explain the pertinence of the reference. 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). In this case, merely pointing to figures 19 and 26 without explaining what portions of the figures Appellee believes disclose the claimed subject matter deprives the Appellant of the opportunity to evaluate the merits of the claims as drafted and respond to the rejection appropriately.

Nonetheless, Appellant has reviewed *Subramaniam* and it does not appear that any portion of *Subramaniam*, much less the cited portions, disclose the aforementioned “displaying a contact center control panel.” As discussed above, cited figure 19 does not disclose the claimed “displaying a contact center control panel.” Figure 19 “illustrates properties of an exemplary Search Category object associated with a Search Definition object.” *Subramaniam*, para. [0040]. The exemplary Search Category object represents the properties of a search that may be performed in the system disclosed by *Subramanian*. It is not a contact center control panel that presents contact information in a graphical user interface.

Figure 26, cited in the rejection, also does not disclose the claimed “displaying a contact center control panel presenting current contact information.” Figure 26 “shows and exemplary Basic Search View and Basic Search Results View” for the user interface disclosed by *Subramaniam*. *Subramaniam*, para. [0162]. According to *Bartz* the Basic Search View includes a Search Selection Applet, Basic Search Applet, and Search Results List Applet. *Subramaniam*, paras. [0162]-[0164]. As Appellant understands *Subramaniam*, these applets are used to select search categories, execute searches, and view searches. *Id.* The Basic Search View and Basic Search Results view illustrated by figure 26 are used to facilitate the searching capabilities disclosed by *Subramaniam*. They do not display a contact center control panel that presents current contact information.

As discussed in this section, the rejection of record fails to set forth the differences in claim 11 over the applied references. The rejection of record also fails to set forth the proposed modification of the applied references necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter or an explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to make the proposed modification as required by *Graham v. John Deere and Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) and M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 11 should be reversed.

C. Claims 14-20

1. Independent Claim 14

Claim 14 recites “an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling the agent’s handling of a contact.” Appellee asserts that this portion of claim 14 is disclosed by paragraph [0082] of *Subramaniam*. Final Action, pg. 10. *Subramaniam* provides no support for Appellee’s characterization of paragraph [0082]. Paragraph [0082] merely discloses that server programs in the system disclosed by *Subramaniam* can be designed to perform functions including “importing and exporting data, configuring the database, executing workflow and process automation, [etc.]” Though paragraph [0082] discloses that server programs in the *Subramaniam* system may execute workflow and enforce business rules, paragraph [0082] does not disclose that the server programs provide an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling handling of a contact. Accordingly,

paragraph [0082] fails to disclose the portions of claim 14 that recites “an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling the agent’s handling of a contact.”

Claim 14 also recites “wherein one of the one or more icons is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow.” Appellee asserts that this portion of claim 14 is disclosed by *Subramaniam*, at paragraph [0082]. Though paragraph [0082] discloses that server programs in the *Subramaniam* system may execute workflow and enforce business rules, paragraph [0082] does not disclose that the server programs select an icon in a graphical user interface according to a step of an automated workflow. Accordingly, paragraph [0082] fails to disclose the portions of claim 14 that recites “wherein one of the one or more icons is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow.” *Bartz* also fails to disclose this portion of claim 14.

As discussed above, *Bartz* discloses a system in which tasks are initiated in response to a user *selecting* a particular icon. *Bartz* expressly states that “[e]lements are selected by a user,” and “user selection of an active element initiates a particular task.” *Bartz* 8:26, 8:35-36. *Bartz*, therefore, does not disclose the claimed “wherein one of the one or more icons is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow.” Because the proposed combination of *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* does not disclose the claimed “automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling the agent’s handling of a contact” and the claimed “wherein one of the one or more icons is selected according to the corresponding step of an automated workflow,” the rejection of claim 14 should be reversed.

Claim 14 further recites “wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the managed application in the managed application display area.” Appellee argues that this portion of claim 14 is disclosed by *Subramaniam*, paragraphs [0072]-[0073] and [0082], and *Bartz*, 2:43-46, 59-66, 4:44-47, 7:57-67, 8:1-48, and figure 4A. Final Action, pp. 10-11. Neither *Subramaniam* nor *Bartz*, however, discloses this portion of claim 14.

As discussed above, paragraphs [0072] and [0073] merely describe the multi-layered architecture of the system disclosed by *Subramaniam*, and paragraph [0082] discloses that server programs in the system disclosed by *Subramaniam* can be designed to perform

functions including “importing and exporting data, configuring the database, executing workflow and process automation, [etc.].” Nothing in these paragraphs discloses a predetermined set of rules that determines the size, placement and visibility of a managed application in a managed application display area. The cited portions of *Bartz* also fail to disclose the claimed “wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area.” Although *Bartz* discloses a system in which a user selected element is associated with windows, nothing in the cited portions of *Bartz* suggests that a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application.

The combination of *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* does not teach or suggest the portion of claim 14 that recites “wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the managed application in the managed application display area,” and Appellee has failed to clearly articulate why this portion of claim 14 would have been obvious. The rejection of record, therefore, does not make a *prima facie* case of obviousness and should be withdrawn. *See In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048 (CCPA 1976).

As discussed in this section, the rejection of record fails to set forth the differences in claim 14 over the applied references. The rejection of record also fails to set forth the proposed modification of the applied references necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter, and an explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to make the proposed modification as required by *Graham v. John Deere and Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) and M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 14 should be reversed.

2. Dependent Claims 15-20

Dependent claims 15-20 inherit all the limitations of independent claim 14. As shown above, the combination of *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* fails to teach each limitation of claim 14. Claims 15-20 are patentable at least for their dependence from claim 14. Moreover, dependent claims 15-20 present additional subject matter that is not taught by *Subramaniam* or *Bartz*. Accordingly, Appellant requests that the rejections of claims 15-20 be reversed.

a. Dependent Claim 16

Claim 16 recites “a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes one or more icons identifying non-managed applications.” Appellee asserts that this portion of claim 16 is disclosed by *Subramaniam*, at figure 26. Final Action, pg. 12. The rejection of claim 16 also ignores 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). Merely citing figure 26, without designating what part of the figure the rejection relies upon deprives the Appellant of the opportunity to appropriately respond to the rejection.

Nevertheless, Appellant has reviewed *Subramaniam* and determined that *Subramaniam* does not disclose the claimed “quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes one or more icons identifying non-managed applications.” *Subramaniam* cannot disclose the claimed “quick start bar” because it does not disclose any task or tool bar that includes icons for identifying “non-managed applications.” Figure 26, which Appellee cites as disclosing the aforementioned portion of claim 15, merely discloses interfaces for accessing the searching capability of the application disclosed by *Subramaniam*. Neither Figure 26, nor the portions of *Subramaniam* explaining Figure 26 disclose a quick start bar that includes one or more icons identifying non-managed applications. *Subramaniam*, paras. [0162]-[0164].

As discussed in this section, the rejection of record fails to set forth the differences in claim 16 over the applied references. The rejection of record also fails to set forth the proposed modification of the applied references necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter, and an explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to make the proposed modification as required by *Graham v. John Deere and Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) and M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 16 should be reversed.

b. Dependent Claim 17

Claim 17 recites “a contact center control panel presenting current contact information.” Appellee asserts that this portion of claim 17 is disclosed by *Subramaniam*. Final Action, pg. 12 (citing *Subramaniam*, figs. 25-27). The rejection of claim 17 also ignores 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). In this case, merely pointing to figures 25-27 without explaining what portions of the figures Appellee believes disclose the claimed subject matter

deprives the Appellant of the opportunity to evaluate the merits of the claims as drafted and respond to the rejection appropriately.

Appellant has reviewed *Subramaniam* and it does not appear that any portion of *Subramaniam*, much less cited figures 25-27, disclose the claimed “contact center control panel presenting current contact information.” Cited figure 25 does not disclose the claimed “contact center control panel presenting current contact information.” Figure 25 discloses “an exemplary Search Selection View” that includes a “Search Selection Applet,” which “supports a dropdown list of search categories and find categories.” The Search Selection View illustrated by Figure 25 does not satisfy the claimed “contact center control panel” because it does not present current contact information, as required by claim 17.

As discussed above, the Basic Search View and Basic Search Results view illustrated by figure 26 do not display a contact center control panel that presents current contact information. The Basic Search View and Basic Search Results view illustrated by figure 26 are used to facilitate the searching capabilities disclosed by *Subramaniam*. Similarly, the Advanced Search View and Advance Search Results View illustrated by figure 27 are used to facilitate the searching abilities disclosed by *Subramaniam*. *Subramaniam* does not suggest that any of the features in these illustrations “present current contact information.” Neither figure 26 nor figure 27, therefore, disclose “a contact center control panel that presents current contact information.”

As discussed in this section, the rejection of record fails to set forth the differences in claim 17 over the applied references. The rejection of record also fails to set forth the proposed modification of the applied references necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter, and an explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to make the proposed modification as required by *Graham v. John Deere and Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) and M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 17 should be reversed.

D. Claims 21-25

1. Independent Claim 21

The rejection of claim 21 ignores 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). Appellee has failed to make arguments with any specificity and has deprived the Appellant of the opportunity to appropriately respond to the rejection. Appellee's approach is exacerbated by the fact that the rejection was made final without affording Appellant the opportunity to respond to the new grounds of rejection presented for the first time in the Final Action or grant Appellant's representative an interview. Nonetheless, Appellant has attempted to respond to the rejection of record.

Independent claim 21 recites "a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes one or more icons for identifying non-managed applications." Appellee asserts that this portion of claim 21 is disclosed by *Subramaniam*, at figures 4 and 26. Final Action, pg. 13. Appellant has reviewed *Subramaniam* and determined that *Subramaniam* does not disclose the claimed "quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes one or more icons identifying non-managed applications." *Subramaniam* does not disclose the claimed "quick start bar" because it does not disclose any task or tool bar that includes icons for identifying "non-managed applications." Figures 4 and 26 merely illustrate interfaces that facilitates the searching capability of the system disclosed by *Subramaniam*. Neither Figure 4, Figure 26, nor the portions of *Subramaniam* that describe Figures 4 and 26 disclose a quick start bar that includes icons for identifying non-managed applications. Compare *Subramaniam*, paras. [0087]-[0088], [0162]-[0164] with Present Application, para. [0027].

Claim 21 also recites "a contact center control panel presenting current contact information, wherein the information indicates a type of call placed by the current contact to the contact center." Appellee asserts that this portion of claim 21 is disclosed by *Subramaniam*, at paragraph [0009] and figures 26 and 27. Final Action, pg. 13. Paragraph [0009] discloses that eBusiness applications are generally designed to allow organizations to create a single source of customer information and are typically built on a component-based architecture. Figures 26 and 27 merely discloses interfaces for accessing the searching capability of the application disclosed by *Subramaniam*. Nothing in these figures or the text describing them suggests that any portion "presents current contact information." Appellee

has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on the combination of *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* because the references do not teach or suggest the claimed “a contact center control panel presenting current contact information, wherein the information indicates a type of call placed by the current contact to the contact center.”

Claim 21 also recites “an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling an agent’s handling of the current contact.” Appellee argues that this portion of claim 21 is disclosed by *Subramaniam* at paragraphs [0082] and [0072] and figure 26. Final Action, pg. 14. Appellant has reviewed *Subramaniam* and it does not appear that any portion discloses the claimed “automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling an agent’s handling of the current contact,” much less the cited portions. Figure 26 merely discloses interfaces for accessing the searching capability of *Subramaniam*. As discussed above, paragraph [0082] discloses that server programs in the system disclosed by *Subramaniam* can be designed to perform functions including executing workflow and process automation, but it does not disclose these servers execute an automatic workflow that defines steps for controlling handling of a contact. And paragraph [0072] describes the multi-layered architecture disclosed by *Subramaniam*. Although *Subramaniam* relates to customer relations management, it does not disclose the claimed “automatic workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling an agent’s handling of the current contact.”

Claim 21 further recites “one or more icons is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow and the type of call indicated by the contact center control pane.” Appellee argues that this portion of claim 21 is disclosed by *Subramaniam* and *Bartz*. As discussed above, neither *Subramaniam* nor *Bartz* discloses selecting an icon according to a step in an automated workflow. Furthermore, the references clearly do not select an icon according to a step in an automated workflow *and* “the type of call indicated by the contact center control pane.” The rejection of record does not address the latter portion of the aforementioned limitations. Because the proposed combination of *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* does not disclose a graphical user interface where one or more icons is selected according to the corresponding step of an automated workflow *and* the type of call indicated by a contact center, Appellee has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claim 21. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 21 should be reversed.

As discussed in this section, the rejection of record fails to set forth the differences in claim 21 over the applied references. The rejection of record also fails to set forth the proposed modification of the applied references necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter or an explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to make the proposed modification as required by *Graham v. John Deere and Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) and M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 21 should be reversed.

2. Dependent Claims 22-25

Dependent claims 22-25 inherit all the limitations of independent claim 21. As shown above, the combination of *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* fails to teach each limitation of claim 21. Claims 22-25 are patentable at least for their dependence from claim 21. Accordingly, Appellant requests that the rejections of claims 22-25 be reversed.

E. Claims 26-29

1. Independent Claim 26

Claim 26 recites “automatically opening one or more applications on the agent’s desktop suitable for aiding the agent in handling the call depending, at least in part, upon the one media type.” Appellee asserts that this portion of claim 26 is disclosed by *Subramaniam* and *Bartz*. Final Action, pp. 16-17. (citing *Subramaniam*, paras. [0008], [0009], [0014], [0082], and figs. 1 & 2).

Rather than pointing out with particularity where in *Subramaniam* the features of claim 26 are disclosed, Appellee states that the claim is disclosed in paragraphs [0008], [0009], [0014], [0082], and Figures 1-2. Final Action, pg. 16. Paragraphs [0008], [0009], and [0014] are included in the background section of *Subramaniam* and describe, generally, aspects of CRM applications and call centers. Paragraphs [0008] and [0009] explain that a CRM application may include tools that automate and streamline customer service, and that eBusiness applications are designed to allow organizations to create a single source of customer information that deliver customer support to various clients on multiple computing platforms. Paragraph [0014] merely discloses that call centers typically provide a consolidated view of the customer to ensure that call center agents have a complete knowledge of customer interactions. None of these three paragraphs disclose automatically

opening one or more applications on the agent's desktop suitable for aiding the agent in handling a call depending upon a media type.

Paragraph [0082] merely discloses that server programs in the system disclosed by *Subramaniam* can be designed to perform functions including "importing and exporting data, configuring the database, executing workflow and process automation, [etc.]." Although paragraph [0082] discloses that server programs in the *Subramaniam* system may execute workflow and enforce business rules, paragraph [0082] does not disclose a method for managing a graphical user interface that includes "automatically opening one or more applications on the agent's desktop" depending on a media type.

Appellee also points to Figures 1 and 2 as disclosing claim 26. Figures 1 and 2 disclose a multi-layered architecture and system components that can be included in a multi-layered architecture for the system described by *Subramaniam*. Nothing in Figures 1 or 2 relates to "automatically opening one or more application's on an agents desktop" depending on a media type.

Bartz also fails to disclose the claimed "automatically opening one or more applications on the agent's desktop suitable for aiding the agent in handling the call depending, at least in part, upon the one media type." As discussed above, *Bartz* discloses a system in which tasks are initiated in response to a user *selecting* a particular icon. *Bartz* expressly states that "[e]lements are selected by a user," and "user selection of an active element initiates a particular task." *Bartz* 8:26, 8:35-36. *Bartz* does not, therefore, teach or suggest the claimed "wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow." Moreover, *Bartz* certainly doesn't disclose automatically opening an application "depending . . . upon the one media type."

The rejection of claim 26 should be withdrawn because the proposed combination of *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* does not teach or suggest at least the portion of claim 26 that recites "automatically opening one or more applications on the agent's desktop suitable for aiding the agent in handling the call depending . . . upon the one media type." As discussed in this section, the rejection of record fails to set forth the differences in claim 21 over the applied references. The rejection of record also fails to set forth the proposed modification of the

applied references necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter or an explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to make the proposed modification as required by *Graham v. John Deere and Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) and M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 26 should be reversed.

2. Dependent Claims 27-29

Dependent claims 27-29 inherit all the limitations of independent claim 26. As shown above, the combination of *Subramaniam* and *Bartz* fails to teach each limitation of claim 26. Claims 27-29 are patentable at least for their dependence from claim 26. Appellant respectfully requests that the Board reverse the rejections of claims 27-29.

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

A copy of the claims involved in the present appeal is attached hereto as Appendix A.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by or relied upon by the Appellee is being submitted.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

No related proceedings are referenced in II. above, hence copies of decisions in related proceedings are not provided.

No fees are required for this Appeal Brief, as they were paid for with the Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief filed September 26, 2007. However, the director is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-2380, under Order No. 47524/P157US/10613152 during the pendency of this Application

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees.

Dated: November 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By R. Ross Viguet
R. Ross Viguet
Registration No.: 42,203
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201-2784
(214) 855-8185
(214) 855-8200 (Fax)
Attorney for Appellant

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via the U. S. Patent and Trademark Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4).

By: Linda L. Gibson
Linda L. Gibson

Date of Transmission: November 24, 2008

APPENDIX A

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. (Previously Presented) A graphical user interface displayed on an agent desktop in a contact center, comprising:

a task bar, wherein the task bar includes one or more icons for identifying managed applications;

a managed application display area that displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow that guides an agent's handling of a contact, and

wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the icon is selected according to the step of the automated workflow.

2. (Previously Presented) The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 further wherein the managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in a separate window.

3. (Previously Presented) The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 further comprising a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes one or more icons for identifying non-managed applications.

4. (Previously Presented) The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 further comprising a contact center control panel presenting current contact information.

5. (Previously Presented) The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 wherein the graphical user interface allows an agent to selectively input data into the at least one managed application displayed in the managed application display area.

6. (Previously Presented) The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 wherein more than one managed application is displayed concurrently in the managed application display area.

7. (Previously Presented) The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 wherein when the agent selects any of the one or more icons a managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in the managed application display area.

8. (Previously Presented) A method of managing a visual space of a customer relations management application, the method comprising:

displaying a managed display having a managed application display area and a task bar, wherein the task bar includes one or more icons for identifying managed applications; and

executing an automated workflow that defines a plurality of steps for-managing a customer call, the automated workflow having at least one step corresponding to each one of the one or more icons, wherein at least one of the icons is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow, and wherein a managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in the managed application display area,

wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the managed application in the managed application display area when the icon identifying the managed application is selected according to the at least one step of the automated workflow.

9. (Previously Presented) The method as claimed in claim 8 further wherein the managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in a separate window.

10. (Previously Presented) The method as claimed in claim 8 further comprising displaying a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes one ore more icons for identifying non-managed applications.

11. (Previously Presented) The method as claimed in claim 8 further comprising displaying a contact center control panel presenting current contact information.

12. (Previously Presented) The method as claimed in claim 8 further comprising selectively inputting data into any one of the least one managed applications.

13. (Previously Presented) The method as claimed in claim 8 further comprising selecting any of the one or more icons thereby displaying the managed application identified by the selected one or more icons in the managed application display area.

14. (Previously Presented) In a system having a central processor, a display, a memory and an input device, a graphical user interface for displaying on an agent's desktop in a contact center, comprising:

a managed display having a task bar, wherein the task bar includes one or more icons for identifying managed applications, wherein a managed application is an application managed, at least in part, by an automated workflow; and

an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling the agent's handling of a contact and having at least one step corresponding to each one of the one or more icons, wherein one of the one or more icons is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow, and a managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in a managed application display area,

wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the managed application in the managed application display area when the icon identifying the managed application is selected according to the at least one step of the automated workflow.

15. (Previously Presented) The system as claimed in claim 14 further wherein the managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in a separate window.

16. (Previously Presented) The system as claimed in claim 14 further comprising a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes one or more icons identifying non-managed applications.

17. (Previously Presented) The system as claimed in claim 14 further comprising a contact center control panel presenting current contact information.

18. (Original) The system as claimed in claim 14 wherein the graphical user interface is displayed on the agent desktop having a display and an input device.

19. (Previously Presented) The system as claimed in claim 18 wherein the input device is used to selectively input data into any one of the at least one managed applications.

20. (Previously Presented) The system as claimed in claim 14 wherein when the agent selects any of the one or more icons, the managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in the managed application display area.

21. (Previously Presented) A graphical user interface displayed on an agent desktop in a contact center, comprising:

a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes one or more icons for identifying non-managed applications;

a contact center control panel presenting current contact information, wherein the information indicates a type of call placed by the current contact to the contact center;

a managed display having a task bar, wherein the task bar includes one or more icons for identifying managed applications;

managed application display area, wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of a managed application in the managed application display area; and

an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling an agent's handling of the current contact and having at least one step corresponding to each one of the one or more icons,

wherein one of the one or more icons is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow and the type of call indicated by the contact center control panel, and the managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in the managed application display area, further wherein the managed application identified by the selected icon is selectively displayed in a separate window.

22. (Previously Presented) The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 21 wherein the agent desktop has a display and an input device.

23. (Previously Presented) The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 22 wherein the input device is used to selectively input data into any one of the least one managed applications.

24. (Previously Presented) The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 23 wherein when the agent selects any of the one or more icons, the managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in the managed application display area.

25. (Previously Presented) The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 23, wherein the type of call is selected from the group consisting of: voice, e-mail, web collaboration, and chat.

26. (Previously Presented) A method for managing a graphical user interface of an agent's desktop in a contact center, the method comprising:

receiving a call at the contact center, the call having one of a plurality of media types;
automatically opening one or more applications on the agent's desktop suitable for aiding the agent in handling the call depending, at least in part, upon the one media type; and
automatically re-configuring the appearance of the graphical user interface as the agent follows steps of a pre-programmed call handling workflow.

27. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 26, wherein automatically re-configuring comprises automatically re-sizing one or more applications, at least in part, as a function of a number of simultaneously open applications.

28. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 27, wherein automatically re-configuring comprises automatically closing one or more applications as the agent follows the steps of the pre-programmed call handling workflow.

29. (Previously Presented) The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 26, wherein the one of the plurality of media types is selected from the group consisting of: voice, e-mail, web collaboration, and chat.

APPENDIX B

No evidence pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by or relied upon by the Appellee is being submitted.

APPENDIX C

No related proceedings are referenced in II. above, hence copies of decisions in related proceedings are not provided.